to higher conditions and faculties and not *vice versa.* Accordingly, while the collective teachings of the Upanishads inspire the hope that we shall one day be ' *gods*) and inherit and parktake of the divine blessedness which belongs to moral perfection, they leave no room for the fear, when interpreted scientifically, that we may one day descend to the brute condition from which we have risen.

For obvious reasons, no rational religion has a right to assert dogmatically the future conditions of our present life. What it asserts must be in the nature of a probable belief, an opinion, an inference, a speculation and not a scientifically demonstrated certainty. I have therefore given below the arguments for and against re-incarnation (re-birth) leaving the intelligent reader to form his own. conclusion.

According to the advocates of re-incarnation, the formation of a soul, i.e., of a complex intellectual and moral organism in the course of a few months or a few years is an impossibility. We are born with definite intellectual and moral characters. Circumstances indeed affect and contribute to the formation of character ; they, however, do not act upon. empty[7] minds and souls

equal and identical
in their blankness, but upon clearly
defined moral power
and tendencies of infinite variety both in
quality and quantity.
If, in mature life, all formations, whether
intellectual or moral
demand a history, an explanation in the
form of a series of
previous actions, and all differences a
difference of history,
does not the complexity, and variety of
endowments with
which our present life begins demand a
similar explanation, a
similar history projected into the unknown
past ? Again
the conditions of ethical progress would
apparently be absent
in a disembodied existence. The ethical
life must be social.
There is neither morality nor spirituality
for an isolated
disembodied being. Virtue is indeed
personal, individual.
There is no meaning in the purity of a
society in which the